

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-6435**

---

ANDROID VICSON TAYLOR,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

RONALD J. ANGELONE, Director of Virginia  
Department of Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. T. S. Ellis, III, District  
Judge. (CA-02-926-A)

---

Submitted: July 10, 2003

Decided: July 16, 2003

---

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Android Vicson Taylor, Appellant Pro Se. Robert H. Anderson, III,  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Android Vicson Taylor, a state prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000). An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). When, as here, a district court dismisses a § 2254 petition solely on procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability will not issue unless the petitioner can demonstrate both "(1) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right' and (2) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling.'" Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 684 (4th Cir.) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)), cert. denied, 534 U.S. 941 (2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Taylor has not made the requisite showing. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322 (2003). Accordingly, we deny Taylor's motion for a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED